RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 1 8 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested. Claims 7-9 have been amended. The amendments are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 25, lines 16-18 and Figure 7. No new matter has been added. Claims 7-9, 14, and 16 are currently under examination. All other pending claims are withdrawn.

Claim 7 is objected to because of an informality. Claim 7 has been amended to change "and abut each" to "abut each" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,031,856 to Wu et al. in view of JP 410021578 to Mai.

Claims 8, 9, 14 and 16 are rejected under.35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu and Mai, and further in view of US 6,160,828 to Kozlov.

Claim 7 is patentable over Wu and Mai, as neither reference teaches or suggests, for example, an electrode structure that includes a transparent electrode layer positioned between the shielding layer and the luminescent layer, and the shielding layer, the transparent electrode layer and the luminescent layer abutting each other and are a unitary structure.

Wu discloses an optical package for eliminating tilt angle between a header and an optical emitter. Optical emitter 26 is disposed on header 28. A can lid 30 is spaced to the sides of and above the optical emitter 26. A glass member 34 with a holographic element 32 thereon is held by can lid 30 above optical emitter 26. The disclosure of Wu is directed to eliminating a tilt angle between the optical emitter and the header, the two of which are spaced apart. Wu does not disclose a transparent electrode layer positioned between the holographic element 32 and the emitter 26. Nor does Wu disclose that the holographic element 32, the emitter 26 and a transparent electrode layer abut each other and are unitary structure.

Mai discloses an LDHU 12 and a hologram element 14 that are arranged at an abutting position. However, a luminescent source 3 and the hologram element 5 (14) are arranged apart from each other. This is evident from Figure 4 of Mai, which provides a detailed view of the LDHU 2 (12) and the hologram element 5 (14) and illustrates the luminescent source 3 layer as being separate from the hologram element 5, with a light

receiving element 9 in between. Mai does not disclose a transparent electrode layer positioned between the hologram element 5 (14) and the LDHU 2 (12). Nor does Mai disclose that the hologram element 5 (14), the LDHU 2 (12) and a transparent electrode layer abut each other and a are unitary structure.

Mai is a similar structure as Wu in that the optical package and the holographic element are separate from each other. Therefore, Wu and Mai do not teach or suggest a transparent electrode layer positioned between the shielding layer and the luminescent layer, and the shielding layer, the transparent electrode layer and the luminescent layer abut each other and are a unitary structure.

In addition, the Mai technology is not equivalent to the Wu technology, because the light receiving element 9 of Mai is an essential element for adjusting the hologram's position which the Wu technology does not require.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition of allowance. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: April 18, 2007

By: Curtis B. Hamre
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165

CBH/jal